



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,900	06/23/2006	Francois Schutze	032013-120	5877
23911	7590	12/23/2008	EXAMINER	
CROWELL & MORING LLP			SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP				
P.O. BOX 14300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/531,900	SCHUTZE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phyllis G. Spivack	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 12-16 and 21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 12-16, 21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

Applicants' Request filed November 26, 2008 for Continued Examination is acknowledged and accepted. Claims 1-11 and 17-20 are canceled. Claims 12-16 and 21 remain under consideration.

Claims 12-16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 12 lacks clarity in that it is unclear whether or not the claimed method of treatment is drawn to the concomitant occurrence of nocturnal gastroesophageal reflux disease **and** Barrett's esophagus. It is unclear whether or not a treatment of nocturnal gastroesophageal reflux disease **or** a treatment of Barrett's esophagus is contemplated.

Clarification is required.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 12-16 and 21 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7 and 9 of allowed, copending Application No. 10/561844. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims encompass a medicament comprising enantiomers of tenatoprazole for use in the treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease.

Claims 12-16 and 21 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-20 of copending Application No. 11/344212. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims encompass a medicament comprising enantiomers of tenatoprazole for use in the treatment of Barrett's esophagus.

Claims 12-16 and 21 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16, 18 and 24-35 of allowed, copending Application No. 10/507485. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the co-pending claims are drawn to compositions comprising tenatoprazole to treat gastroesophageal reflux disease and Barrett's esophagus.

These are provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 12-16 and 21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8, 9 and 14-25 of U.S. Patent 7,034,038. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims encompass a medicament comprising enantiomers of tenatoprazole to treat gastroesophageal reflux disease and Barrett's esophagus.

Applicants choose to hold these obviousness-type double patenting rejections in abeyance.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 12-16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barth et al., US 2006/0024238.

Barth teaches the administration of one proton pump inhibitor, such as tenatoprazole, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof, in the treatment of atypical and esophageal symptoms of gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD). Barth's teaching also encompasses treating Barrett's esophagus. See paragraph [0009], page 2, paragraph [0044] page 5, and claims 9, 12, 14 and 18, pages 13-14. Tenatoprazole is specifically included in Barth's teaching in claim 18. Dosages, as required by instant claims 15 and 16, are taught to be preferably about 10-30 mg per day, in paragraph [0091], page 9. As required by instant claim 14, injectable preparations are disclosed in paragraph [0096], page 9. Medicaments comprising proton pump inhibitors for oral administration are disclosed in paragraph [0097] on page 10.

Applicants argue the two provisional applications of the Barth document, which were filed in 2002, do not disclose the subject matter of the present application.

Provisional application 60/404,154, filed August 19, 2002, states on page 15 of the specification, that any proton pump inhibitor is encompassed in the teaching. See lines 23-24. It is stated on page 3, line 12, of this provisional application that any gastrointestinal disorder is encompassed in the disclosure. Gastroesophageal reflux disease, as well as Barrett's esophagus, is recited. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is proper.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Phyllis G. Spivack whose telephone number is 571-272-0585. The Examiner can normally be reached from 10:30 to 7 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful after one business day, the Examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Phyllis G. Spivack/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614

December 19, 2008